

DAYLE ELIESON
United States Attorney
District of Nevada

MARK E. WOOLF
Assistant United States Attorney
501 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Suite 1100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: 702-388-6336
Email: mark.woolf@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the United States.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

LORENZO TUCKER, III,)	
)	Case No. 2:18-cv-00962-JCM-CWH
Plaintiff,)	
)	MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
v.)	TO RESPOND
)	
JODONA L. BROWN, <i>et al.</i> ,)	(First Request)
)	
Defendants.)	

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A) and Local Rule IA 6-1(a), the United States of America (“United States”), on behalf of Federal Defendant Jodona L. Brown (“Federal Defendant”), hereby moves for a 60-day extension of time, as measured from the date of removal, May 25, 2018, to file its answer or other response. The new deadline would be **Tuesday, July 24, 2018**. This is the United States’ first request for extension and, as set forth herein, there is good cause for the request.

As near as the United States can tell, plaintiff is seeking to assert, either or both, a *Bivens* claim or tort claim under the Federal Tort Claims Act against the Federal Defendant. Normally, when asserting claims against a United States officer or employee, such as the Federal Defendant in this matter, the time period for response is 60 days after service on the

1 United States Attorney.¹ However, because this action was removed from state court after
2 receipt of the initial pleading by the Federal Defendant, the period for filing an answer or other
3 response is 7 days after the removal was filed. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 81(c)(2). At least one court
4 has acknowledged the apparent conflict between Rule 12(a) and Rule 81(c) and held that, “in
5 the interests of justice and the policies undergirding the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure”, the
6 Government should be given at least that amount of time to file an answer or other responsive
7 motion that it would have had if the case were originally filed in federal court. *See B & C*
8 *Enterprises, LLC v. FEMA*, 2006 WL 305326 (S.D. W. Va. Feb. 2, 2006).

9 Moreover, the filing that plaintiff has characterized as a complaint is largely
10 unintelligible and will take additional time and resources to review. The scattered, factually
11 unsupported allegations range from a claim of collusion with the sentencing judge and
12 prosecuting attorney during a probation revocation proceeding (*see United States v. Tucker*,
13 2:08-cr-00025-KJD-CWH, ECF Nos. 228, 229) to vague assertions of fraud, and violations of
14 constitutional rights under “color of law.” The United States needs additional time to review
15 plaintiff’s pleading, the incomplete documents attached thereto, and the record of the
16 proceeding/s from which the complaint appears to stem in order to file its response.

17 This extension is not sought for delay or any other improper purpose, but to allow the
18 United States to fully evaluate the claims asserted by plaintiff and the defenses thereto.

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ¹ A *Bivens* claim is asserted against United States officers or employees in their individual
27 capacity and responsive pleading is normally due within the later of 60 days after service on the
28 employee or the United States Attorney. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(3). A responsive pleading in
cases involving claims against United States officers or employees in their official capacity is
due within 60 days after service on the United States Attorney. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(2).

1 WHEREFORE, for the above reasons, the United States respectfully requests the instant
2 motion extending time for the United States to file a response until July 24, 2018, be granted.

3 Respectfully submitted this 30th day of May 2018.

4 DAYLE ELIESON
5 United States Attorney

6 /s/ Mark E. Woolf
7 MARK E. WOOLF
8 Assistant United States Attorney
9
10

11 IT IS SO ORDERED:

12 
13 _____
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15 DATED: June 1, 2018
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Mark E. Woolf, hereby certify that the **MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND** was served this date on all parties via the Court's Electronic Case Filing system, and as indicated below:

U.S. Mail:

Lorenzo Tucker, III
617 W. Colton Avenue
North Las Vegas, Nevada 89032

Dated this 30th day of May 2018.

/s/ Mark E. Woolf
MARK E. WOOLF
Assistant United States Attorney